



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,060	02/18/2004	Bart De Corte	PRD-26 CIP	5753
27777	7590	03/05/2007		
PHILIP S. JOHNSON JOHNSON & JOHNSON ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003			EXAMINER SOLOLA, TAOFIQ A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1625	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/782,060

Applicant(s)

DE CORTE ET AL.

Examiner

Taofiq A. Solola

Art Unit

1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-90 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-77 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) 78-90 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 2/18/04 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1625

Claims 1-90 are pending in this application.

Claims 78-90, and 1-77, (in part) are drawn to non-elected invention.

Response to Restriction Requirement

The election of group I, claim 6, with traverse in the Paper filed 1/15/07 is hereby acknowledged. The traversal is on the basis that groups I-XII are closely related and therefore do not constitute independent and distinct inventions. This is not persuasive because applicant fails to provide any conclusive evidence in support of the argument. However, new groupings for the inventions are as follows:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. The Markush group set forth in the claims includes both independent and distinct inventions, and patentably distinct compounds (or species) within each invention. However, this application discloses and claims a plurality of patentably distinct inventions far too numerous to list individually. Moreover, each of these inventions contains a plurality of patentably distinct compounds, also far too numerous to list individually. For these reasons provided below, restriction to one of the following Groups is required under 35 U.S.C. 121, wherein a Group is a set of patentably distinct inventions of a broad statutory category (e.g. compounds, methods of use, methods of making, etc.):

I. Claims 1-77 (in part), drawn to targeting ligands and conjugates of compounds of formula I, classifiable in several heterocyclic classes (540, 544, 548, 546) and non-heterocyclic classes (558, 562, etc.), numerous subclasses.

II. 1-77 (in part), drawn to targeting ligands and conjugates of compounds of formula II, classifiable in several heterocyclic classes (540, 544, 548, 546) and non-heterocyclic classes (558, 562, etc.), numerous subclasses.

Art Unit: 1625

III. Claims 78, 86-90, drawn to non-specific liposome, structure of product unknown, possibly classifiable in several heterocyclic classes (540, 544, 544, 548, 546) and non-heterocyclic classes (558, 562, etc.), numerous subclasses.

2. In addition to an election of one of the inventions of group I-III above, restriction is further required under 35 U.S.C. 121 as follows:

3. If group III is elected applicant is required to elect one of formulae I-II, and the invention would be examined commensurate in scope with claims 79-85 (in part).

In accordance with the decisions in *In re Harnisch*, 631 F.2d 716, 206 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1980); and *Ex parte Hozumi*, 3 USPQ2d 1059 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1984), restriction of a Markush group is proper where the compounds within the group either (1) do not share a common utility, or (2) do not share a substantial structural feature disclosed as being essential to that utility. In addition, a Markush group may encompass a plurality of independent and distinct inventions where two or more members are so unrelated and diverse that a prior art reference anticipating the claim with respect to one of the members would not render the other member(s) obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103.

4. In an election of any of Groups I-II, an election of a single compound (or set of compounds) is further required including an exact definition of each substitution on the base molecule (Formula I), wherein a single member at each substituent group or moiety is selected. For example, if a base molecule has a substituent group R1, wherein R1 is recited to be any one of H, OH, COOH, aryl, alkoxy, halogen, amino, etc., then applicant must select a single substituent of R1, for example OH or aryl, and each subsequent variable position.

In the instant case, Applicant need not elect one representative for each of R2, Z, W and q, in formula I or II and the point of attachment of each elected substituent must be specified. The elected substituents must be specific not generic so as to define a species disclosed in the specification. Applicant must identify the parts of the species corresponding to the substituents in formula I or II.

Applicant should note that it may not be possible to search all the compounds within each group of the instant invention due to numerous and extensive substituents and lack of a substantial structural element shared by all the compounds, which has a utility.

Art Unit: 1625

Upon election of a single compound (or set of compounds), the Office will review the claims and disclosure to determine the scope of the independent invention encompassing the elected compound (compounds which are so similar thereto as to be within the same inventive concept and reduction to practice). The scope of an independent invention will encompass all compounds within the scope of the claim, which fall into the same class and subclass as the elected compound (or set of compounds), but may also include additional compounds, which fall in related subclasses. Examination will then proceed on the elected compound AND the entire scope of the invention encompassing the elected compound as defined by common classification. A clear statement of the examined invention, defined by those class(es) and subclass(es) will be set forth in the first action on the merits. Note that the restriction requirement will not be made final until such time as applicant is informed of the full scope of compounds along with process of using said compound under examination. This will be set forth by reference to specific class(es) and subclass(es) examined. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the compounds are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the compounds to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C 103(a) of the other.

All compounds falling outside the class(es) and subclass(es) of the selected compound and any other subclass encompassed by the election above will be directed to nonelected subject matter and will be withdrawn from consideration under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 37 C.F.R.

1.142(b). Applicant may reserve the right to file divisional applications on the remaining subject matter. The provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 apply with regard to double patenting covering divisional applications.

Applicant is reminded that upon cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventors must be amended in compliance with 37C.F.R. 1.48(b) if one of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37CFR 1.17(i).

If desired upon election of a single compound, applicants can review the claims and disclosure to determine the scope of the invention and can **set forth** a group of compounds, which are so similar within the same inventive concept and reduction to practice. Markush claims must be provided with support in the disclosure for each member of the Markush group. See MPEP 608.01(p). Applicant should exercise caution in making a selection of a single member for each substituent group on the base molecule to be consistent with the written description.

Rationale Establishing Patentable Distinctiveness Within Each Group

Art Unit: 1625

Each Invention Set listed above is directed to or involves the use or making of compounds which are recognized in the art as being distinct from one another because of their diverse chemical structure, their different chemical properties, modes of action, different effects and reactive conditions (MPEP 806.04, MPEP 808.01). Additionally, the level of skill in the art is not such that one invention would be obvious over either of the other inventions, i.e. they are patentable over each other. Chemical structures, which are similar are presumed to function similarly, whereas chemical structures that are not similar are not presumed to function similarly. The presumption even for similar chemical structures though is not irrebutable, but may be overcome by scientific reasoning or evidence showing that the structure of the prior art would not have been expected to function as the structure of the claimed invention. Note that in accordance with the holdings of Application of Papesch, 50 CCPA 1084, 315 F.2d 381, 137 USPQ 43 (CCPA 1963) and In re Lalu, 223 USPQ 1257 (Fed. Cir. 1984), chemical structures are patentably distinct where the structures are either not structurally similar, or the prior art fails to suggest a function of a claimed compound would have been expected from a similar structure.

The above Groups represent general areas wherein the inventions are independent and distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

1. The inventions of groups I and II are not related. They relate to two different compounds having different structures and a prior art anticipating one would not render obvious the other one.
2. The inventions of groups I-II and III are not related. While I-II relate to two different compounds having different structures, III relates to no particular compound. Therefore, the inventions of groups I-III are independent and distinct.

Art Unit: 1625

In addition, because of the plethora of classes and subclasses in each of the Groups, a serious burden is imposed on the examiner to perform a complete search of the defined areas. Therefore, because of the reasons given above, the restriction set forth is proper and not to restrict would impose a serious burden in the examination of this application.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

In the Paper filed 1/15/07, applicant elected group I, claim 6, and also elected compound 38b, all of which fall within the new group I. Therefore, new group I, is deemed constructively elected by previous election. As a result of the election, claims 1-77 are being examined in part.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-77, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1625

The terms "1_{1a}" and "2_{2a}" have no proper antecedent basis in formula (I). "R₂" in formula (I) is not defined in the claims. For example, see claims 1, 27-30, 39-40, 66-69, 76. Therefore, claims 1-77 are indefinite. Appropriate correction is required.

The term "preferably" in claim 77, and every occurrence renders the claims indefinite. The term implies there are other representative substituents of "W", which are not listed in the claims. By deleting "preferably" in every occurrence the rejection would be overcome.

Objection

Claims 1-77 are objected to for containing non-elected invention of formula II.

Abstract

Per MPEP, the abstract should be on a separate page, not included with claims as in the instant. Appropriate correction is required.

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taofiq A. Solola, PhD. JD., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0709.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Thomas McKenzie, can be reached on (571) 272-0670. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Art Unit: 1625

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Solola', with a stylized flourish at the end.

TAOFIQ SOLOLA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Group 1625

February 24, 2007